UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,667	03/25/2004	Jens Feierabend	P06104US2	6213
34082 ZARLEY LAW	7590 09/29/200 FIRM P.L.C.	9/2008	EXAMINER	
CAPITAL SQU	JARE		CARTAGENA, MELVIN A	
400 LOCUST, SUITE 200 DES MOINES, IA 50309-2350			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3754	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/29/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/808,667	FEIERABEND, JENS	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	MELVIN A. CARTAGENA	3754					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>14 August 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	THE REPLY FILED 14 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as let forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the properties of Appeal has been filed.	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS		20 (
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better the content of the property of the content of the con	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);					
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	nnliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324)				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inplication (i	102 021).				
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an ex	kplanation of				
Claim(s) objected to: <u>34-37</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>22,25,27,28,30,32,33 and 38-43</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a				
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u> 	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	1. 🛮 The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:						
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Kevin P. Shaver/	/M. A. C./						
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3754	Examiner, Art Unit 3754						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that claim 22 is directed to the embodiment of Fig. 8 and that the reference of Schwanenberg lacks a connecting wall between the membrane and the support segment forming an obtuse angle along an area of the connecting wall. Schwanenberg shows a connecting wall between the membrane and the support section forming an obtuse angle, see Figs. 1-8; In addition, claim 22 can not be directed to the embodiment of Fig. 8 because this embodiment lacks the annular section 13.

Applicant argues that Schwanenberg does not shows the membrane member having three slits as claimed in claim 42. Schwanenberg shows a pressure actuated valve having a membrane with at least one slit, see claim 1, and depicts a membrane with five slits in the Figs. Therefore, Schwanenberg discloses a membrane member having between one and five slits.

Applicant argues that Schwanenberg is silent about an annular protrusion projecting away from the container; Schwanenberg shows an annular protrusion 24 projecting away from the container as claimed in claim 43.